DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 294 SP 038 084

AUTHOR Clinard, Linda McCorkel; Ariav, Tamar
TITLE What Mentoring Does for Mentors: A Cross-Cultural Perspective.
PUB DATE 1997-03-00
NOTE 26p.; A draft version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Cooperating Teachers; Cultural Differences; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Mentors; Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development Schools; Program Evaluation; Student Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Israel

ABSTRACT

This study explored the perceptions of mentor teachers about the impact of mentoring on them. The study involved cross-cultural collaborative research between an American and an Israeli teacher education program and a collaboration within each country between the teacher education program and its elementary professional development school (PDS). Mentors received training in cognitive coaching and participated in ongoing dialogue. Data collection in each country involved observations, conversations, and end-of-year questionnaires which investigated the benefits of mentoring for mentors. In each country, reflection sessions with mentors shared data that had been collected from their peers abroad. Results indicated large differences between American and Israeli mentors in their perceptions of what they gained from the mentoring experience. Both groups believed that the mentoring experience influenced their work in the classroom. Mentoring also influenced both groups' professional and private lives beyond the classroom. The dialogue meetings and reflection sessions were the most important components in developing awareness and understanding of mentors' roles in the PDS. Mentoring required a long time to develop, with teachers coming to grips with their new roles after spending time (often years) in the process. All mentors acknowledged the crucial role of training in cognitive coaching for their mentoring activity. (Contains 38 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TM

What Mentoring Does for Mentors: A Cross-Cultural Perspective

ED 422 294

Linda McCorkel Clinard, University of California, Irvine

Biographical statement: Linda Clinard is currently the Professional Development School Staff Development Liaison for the University of California-Irvine, Department of Education. She is a lecturer with specialization in curriculum development and literacy education.

Tamar Ariav, Beit Berl College, Israel

Biographical statement: Tamar Ariav is the director of The Curriculum Center at Beit Berl College,Israel. She is a lecturer in curriculum, instruction and evaluation.

A draft of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association Conference, Chicago, March, 1997.

The authors wish to thank four colleagues who provided invaluable insights as we developed this paper: Iris Botzer, Afek Elementary School, Israel; Judi Conroy, University High School, Irvine, CA.; Kathy Laycock, Thorman Elementary School, Tustin, CA.; and Kathy Yule, Los Alisos Middle School, Mission Viejo, CA.

Dr. Linda M. Clinard
Department of Education
2001 Berkeley Place
University of California-Irvine
Irvine, CA 92697
Phone: (714) 824-5117
FAX: (714) 824-2965
e-mail: lclinard@uci.edu

Dr. Tamar Ariav
School of Education
Beit Berl College
Kfar Saba
ISRAEL 44905
Phone: (09) 747-6295
FAX: (09) 747-6258
e-mail: ariavt@beitberl.ac.il

Accepted for publication in *European Journal of Teacher Education*, Spring, 1998.

SP 038 847

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Clinard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Introduction

This study explores the perceptions of mentor teachers about the impact of mentoring on them. The study has two layers: (1) A cross-cultural collaborative research between an American and an Israeli teacher education program in two institutions; (2) A collaboration within each country between the teacher education program and its Professional Development Schools. The study involves the implementation of a comparable approach to mentoring and mentor teacher development in both teacher education programs, the collection of comparable data on mentors' perceptions of the mentoring process and its impact on them, and the reflection of mentors in each country on their own data and the data of their colleagues abroad. The findings reveal what mentors think they get out of the mentoring experience, particularly in relation to their own classroom practice, their professional image, and their lives beyond the classroom. Similarities and differences across cultures help us better understand the mentoring process beyond contextual, site-specific characteristics.

From cooperating teacher to mentor teacher

The restructuring of teacher education and the development of PDS networks has created a new context for the role of mentor teachers in student teaching (e.g., Ungaretti, et al., 1997; Clinard et al., 1997; Lee and Wilkes, 1996; Winograd, et al., 1995; Anderson, 1993; Feiman-Nemser, Parker and Zeichner, 1993; Holmes Group, 1990). There are ideological differences among models of mentoring, but they all seem to share common purposes: (a) help student teachers develop an appropriate body of practical knowledge with which to frame teaching experiences; and (b) encourage student teachers to develop a deeper and more complex understanding of the assumptions they are making about that practical professional knowledge (Furlong and Maynard, 1995). Addressing these purposes requires mentors to work differently with student teachers – compared with more traditional cooperating teachers' work. Mentors are now expected to use a variety of strategies, such as listening skills, collaborative teaching, in-depth observation methods, debriefing and feedback using reflection-on-action, and various modes of participatory evaluation. Mentors are also expected to promote practices which support school reform and the advancement of student learning (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Feiman-Nemser, Parker and Zeichner, 1993). Recent research suggests possible effective ways to prepare cooperating teachers for their new role as mentors of student teachers (e.g., Jacque, 1995; Turner, 1995; Kelly, Beck and apThomas, 1995). The growing expectations for mentors raise the question of "what's in it for the mentor"? Why would cooperating teachers become mentors, invest in a time-consuming coaching process, and commit themselves to reforming their pedagogy ? Unless payment or release time is involved, other benefits seem to be hidden in the mentoring process.

As Clement (1996) suggests, it is assumed that mentors benefit from working with novices, but this assumption is considered a common-sense belief, and it does not appear to have been directly examined. Andrews (1987) proposes five benefits teachers experience from their professional interactions as they undertake a supervisory role with novices: Mentors (1) gain constructive feedback on their own teaching; (2) experience peer supervision; (3) gain curriculum management expertise; (4) gain experience in educational consultancy; and (5) encourage critical reflection in teaching. Shaw (1995) suggests that mentoring offers teachers a variety of bonuses: it looks good on a curriculum vitae, it might be part of one's professional accreditation, it enhances the professional status within the practitioners community, and it might contribute to improved practice. In addition, says Shaw, mentors may appreciate having the chance to discuss pedagogy with others and the isolation of those who work in small departments is lessened.

While most writing on what mentoring does for mentors describes desired contributions, a number of studies describe the empirical impact of mentoring on mentors (e.g., Reich, 1995; Turner, 1995). Among the prevalent effects are greater self-confidence, enhanced awareness of one's own strengths, improved managerial skills, and improved performance in group work. The impact of mentoring on mentors needs to be further examined. Positive findings could be presented to mentors to increase their interest, motivation, as well as contribute to their satisfaction and good feeling. Moreover, a more sensitive exploration is needed to examine the impact on mentors in specific areas -- their own teaching, their professional image, and beyond the classroom. These three dimensions are the focus of our study which relies on a cross-cultural perspective.

The specific research questions all deal with mentors' perceptions:

1. What benefits do mentors gain from working with student teachers?
2. Is the mentoring experience having any effect on the mentor's practice (with their students)?
3. Is the mentoring experience having any effect on the mentor beyond the classroom (as professionals and as private individuals)?

Context of the Study

We began our international collaboration in 1993 when Tamar spent a year at the University of California - Irvine (UCI) as a visiting scholar. This was the third year of the UCI Professional Development School program which began in 1991, but the first year of substantial changes in the mentoring and student teaching components. After two years of discussions between the Department of Education at UCI and school/district partners, a platform was developed preparing for a new phase led by Linda. The work in the preparatory stage from 1991 to 1993 and the proposed change from 1993 and beyond were influenced by the concepts of Professional

Development Schools and the idea of life-long professional development. The notion of PDS (Holmes Report, 1986) and its various interpretations (e.g., Pine, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 1994) set the ground for connecting school renewal and teacher education reform (Grimmett, 1996; Johnston, 1996; Franke and Dahlgrew, 1996; Broko and Mayfield, 1995; Tsui, 1995; Powel, 1995; Anderson, 1993; Levine, 1992; Goodlad, 1991, 1990; Lieberman and Miller, 1990). The understanding that preservice is only a beginning stage in teacher development (e.g., Wileen and Grimmeett, 1995; Holmes Report, 1995) helps create bridges between teacher education programs and the workplace of practicing teachers. These two trends guided the design of the UCI/PDS program and later the collaboration of Beit Berl College with its partner school.

The changes introduced in the UCI/PDS program when we began our collaboration in 1993 were:

•New titles: Master teachers were called "University Associates" and university supervisors were called "Subject Matter Methods Advisors." This formal changeresulted from feedback collected during early (1991-93) UCI/PDS meetings in which it was clear that the new stage of school/university collaboration should utilize the subject matter expertise of university faculty and the practitioner knowledge of University Associates. This was not a cosmetic change but rather a substantial one. The Advisors' role in student teaching supervision now focused upon providing subject-matter expertise to student teachers and K-12 partners through seminars and regular visits to PDS sites. Most of the day-to-day interaction with student teachers about instruction, parent communication, and other professional responsibilities was done with the mentors. The University Associates were , therefore, invited to student teacher orientation, became more familiar with the teacher education curriculum and requirements, and participated in university activities. The new role implied clear and written expectations of the mentoring process in terms of timing of student teachers' assignments, use of Cognitive Coaching skills and tools, filling out reflection forms with student teachers, participation in dialogue meetings, providing detailed collaborative evaluation of student teachers, and developing channels of communication with the Advisors and other Department of Education faculty.

•Staff Development Liaison: A new position was created to facilitate the change in the role of University Associates (mentors) and improve it. In 1993 Linda became Staff Development Liaison for the program. She was responsible for direct work with the mentors which included arranging training seminars, providing make-up and support sessions, and leading dialogue meetings throughout the mentoring period. As a liaison, Linda met with the Advisors, student teachers, and central administration personnel, and collaborated with the

Elementary Program Coordinator, Mary Roosevelt, to support and develop the program by arranging for university faculty to assist schools and advise them in special projects.

•Mentor Preparation: All mentors were offered various degrees of training. Full-day training in Cognitive Coaching is conducted by Marilyn Tabor, national trainer for the Institute of Intelligent Behavior, Sacramento, California. Linda has offered half-day "make-up" seminars in Cognitive Coaching and on-going support and advice. The Cognitive Coaching model (Costa and Garmston, 1994) is a coaching approach that establishes and maintains TRUST between mentor and mentee, facilitates MUTUAL LEARNING engaging and transforming mental processes and perceptions, and enhances individual autonomy, as well as interdependency with the group. It is a person-oriented approach which emphasizes reflective thinking, non-judgmental feedback and empowerment processes. The seminars for mentors dealt with the underpinning philosophy of the approach, the coaching cycle (see Appendix A), specific coaching strategies (e.g., questioning techniques, observational tools, and listening modes), the challenges of implementation, and the need for systematic data collection on student teachers.

•Collaborative action research: We initiated a framework for an action research study based on the principles by Goswani and Stillman (1987) and Oja and Smulyan (1989): (a) a focus on teacher involvement in defining and solving problems (we engaged many mentors in framing issues for the study through the dialogue meetings and the end-of-the-year evaluations of the project); (b) an emphasis on collaboration between school teachers and university professors (which was clear through the role definitions and relationships, shared analysis and interpretation of the data, and common presentations in conferences and forums); and (c) a problem-solving approach encouraging explication of and reflection on practice (which was the essence of the dialogue meetings and reflective sessions). Collaborative action research focuses on practice, advocates professional development, and elaborates on practical theories of teaching and learning. It is promoted by teacher educators as an effective form of professional development of teachers (e.g., Zeichner, 1997; Furlong and Maynard, 1995).

When Tamar returned to Israel for the 1994-95 school year, she presented the project at Beit Berl College and was assigned to explore a similar application there. This required a translation of all the mentor training materials and research tools into Hebrew. Because there was no time for a slow negotiation with school/district personnel, the project started in Israel following the plans of the third year at UCI. It is important to note that the Professional Development School concept and new perceptions of mentoring were only beginning to emerge in Israel in 1994. The Ministry of Education initiated at that time centrally organized mentor programs in some teachers colleges. Financial support was given only to mentor preparation on-campus without

any school-based component. Since the project of Beit Berl College proposed a site-oriented mentor program within a broader PDS model, it did not comply with the funding criteria of the Ministry and was, therefore, supported by the College as a pilot.

The nature of the two teacher education programs and the socio-cultural-political context in which they operate are very different. The table below highlights some of the important parameters:

Institution Parameter	**University of California - Irvine, USA**	**Beit Berl College, Israel**
Duration of the project	from 1991 until the present	1994 - 1996
Number of participating schools	55 K-12 schools	1 elementary school
Number of participating mentors	158 (an average of 3 from each school)	21 (all from one school)
Participating student teachers	122 fifth year elementary and secondary credential programs, most enter directly after completing undergraduate program, average age 24-25	14 freshmen students in the elementary preservice program, most enter after two years of military service, average age 22
Type of teacher education institution	graduate level - fifth year program, average of 120 student teachers, 15 fte faculty, in the same department with doctoral studies, department is part of a large university (UC system)	undergraduate level - four year program, average of 4,500 students in teacher education and 1,500 in other educational professions, 350 fte faculty, college of education only and the largest in Israel, preparation for early childhood, elementary, secondary, special education

Cross-cultural communication and data collection has continued through March, 1997. During our cross-cultural collaboration, we have been aware of the problems inherent in the study

because of the clear differences between the American and Israeli teacher education programs. The use of the same research methodology in both places and the opportunity we created for direct dialogue among mentors from both countries are features which helped relate the mutual findings and interpret them. The introduction to this paper explains that the study has two layers, one is the action research carried out in each country , and the other is our cross-cultural "comparative" collaborative research. The particular methods applied for each layer are described below.

Methodology

A cyclic process of (1) data collection, (2) analysis, and (3) interpretation has become a major thread in the developing relationships in our school - teacher education program partnerships (Clinard, Miron, Ariav, Botzer, Conroy, Laycock and Yule, 1997; Ariav and Clinard, 1996; Clinard, Ariav, Beeson, Dwyer and Minor, 1995; Clinard and Roosevelt, 1993). Our methodology could be characterized as a qualitative design which includes a quantitative method at certain points. For example, we have introduced a questionnaire which yielded quantitative data at the end of each year to help us examine the more qualitative data which have been collected continuously. We used the quantitative findings from the questionnaire as tentative raw materials for reflection and interpretations by the mentor teachers, and for formative purposes of further planning.

Within each culture, a collaborative action research took place using the elements by Goswani and Stillman (1987) and Oja and Smulyan (1989) (see above). The work of each teacher education program with its mentors included joint collection, analysis and interpretation of data, as well as co-presentation of the research at various times. The following methods were used in the US and Israel for local data collection. The first stage of data collection included dialogues/observations, informal interaction, and evolving questionnaires:

- University Associate/College Associate dialogues were scheduled regularly at school sites, approximately 4 to 8 times during student teaching, depending on the length of the mentoring experience. Each meeting was approximately two hours long. Meetings in Israel were all in "Afek" Elementary and meetings in California were held in different hosting schools and attended by teachers from the same school district or geographical proximity. The purpose of the dialogues was to discuss the mentoring process, share problems, brainstorm solutions with colleagues, ask for assistance in certain areas, etc. The dialogues were led in Israel and the US by Tamar and Linda respectively, who acted as participant observers of the process. They were scripted or taped by us, as well as by mentor teachers . Yearly participation of mentors in the dialogues averaged 67% in California and 90% in Israel.

- Informal interaction among the principals, the mentor teachers and the university or college faculty provided more personal information that enriched the group data of the dialogues. Chatting before or after dialogue meetings, telephone conversations about particular student teachers, written notes and the like became an important source of information on an individual level. The anecdotes and vignettes were put in a log and used in the dialogues as mini-cases, in the reflection sessions, and in the questionnaires (see below).

- End-of-the-year questionnaires were suggested in 1993-94 by UCI/PDS mentors. Questions were developed based upon the patterns and issues which emerged from the dialogues and informal conversations. The first version of the questionnaire was distributed in California in 1994; after revision, adaptation and translation into Hebrew, it was administered in Israel in 1995. Early questionnaires contained numerous open-ended questions about various aspects of the project. Two questions yielded insights about the benefits of mentoring for mentors. Responses to these questions, as well as data collected throughout the dialogues and interactions in the following year, helped shape the second version of the questionnaire which was distributed in California in 1995 and 1996. This second questionnaire was translated and adapted at BBC in 1996 for distribution in Israel (adaptation refers mainly to terminology). Response rate on the questionnaires averaged 56.3% in California over three years and 44% in Israel over two years. Data presented in this paper are from the second questionnaire.

The second stage of data collection began in Winter 1997 and included in each country reflection sessions with mentors. The purpose of the reflection sessions was to share with mentors the data which had been collected over the years about them and their peers abroad. Teachers from Israel and California examined the data, provided their explanations and interpretations of the meaning of the data, and compared their perceptions with the perceptions of the other culture. In Israel and in the US, the Winter 1997 reflection sessions were done either in small groups or individually, and the discussions were recorded and scripted by us. In Israel, this second stage happened after the project ended in Summer 1996 due to lack of funding for continuation of the PDS program at BBC, and because Tamar was assigned to another position in the College. In the US however, the PDS program has continued and the reflection sessions took place as a built-in component.

Across cultures we used the following methods:

- Use of the same database of qualitative and quantitative data from each institution which allowed us to relate findings easily.
- Cross-cultural discourse between one Israeli mentor from "Afek" Elementary and three American mentors from three schools in Orange County. We are aware of the limitations of one representative from Israel and three representatives from the US in these discussions, but

we think that their talking did help clarify issues and support the data collected earlier. The AERA 1997 annual meeting, where we all presented our study together, provided a unique opportunity for direct interaction between mentors who were involved in similar training, experienced some common processes, and knew about each other's findings. The mentors stayed together in hotel rooms and spent five intensive days together. Many discussions were taped, some were scripted and at the end each mentor wrote an "impression report". These data include mentors' stories, clarifications of each other's contextual situation, explanations of differences between experiences as they relate to age, teaching experience, and experiences beyond the classroom.

Qualitative data from 1993 up to 1997 were entered in a qualitative database, content analyzed, and categorized. Quantitative data were entered into another database and processed (means, percentages, rank order, etc.). We have constantly co-examined both databases using them as supplementary sources of insight and further inquiry.

Cross-Cultural Interpretations and Discoveries

The findings present the cross-cultural perspective of mentors' perceptions about the benefits they draw from the mentoring experience. We have chosen to present them according to the research questions and illuminate them with mentors' interpretations, as well as our insights.

(1) Benefits gained from working with student teachers

Large differences emerged between American and Israeli mentors in their perception of what they take for themselves out of the mentoring experience. Table 1 shows the averages and rank orders of both groups on a list of possible benefits which were identified through the dialogues, informal interaction and the first version of the questionnaire. These benefits were raised primarily by the American mentors and mentioned very little by the Israeli mentors. It was not surprising to us that the two groups of mentors viewed differently the contribution of working with student teachers to them, however, the magnitude of this difference, which became clear through the quantitative data in the questionnaire, was alarming. As mentioned earlier, Cognitive Coaching is an approach that fosters mutual learning and trust. We expected that mentors who were trained in Cognitive Coaching and were using it in the mentoring process would indeed trust student teachers and learn something from them (not only contribute to student teachers). This happened with the Californian but not with the Israeli mentors.

Table 1*

Averages and Rank Order of

Benefits gained from working with Student Teachers

BENEFITS	UCI MENTORS		BBC MENTORS	
	Average	Rank	Average	Rank
Enthusiasm	3.50	1	1.04	3
Opportunity to Collaborate	3.34	2	1.57	1
Knowledge of subject matter	2.93	3	0.65	4
Reflective Mirror	2.90	4	1.23	2
Innovative strategies for teaching	2.90	4	0.31	8
Technology expertise	2.76	5	0.53	6
Insights about individual students' background	2.54	6	0.61	5
Assessment strategies	2.34	7	0.46	7
Sheltered language insights	1.68	9	-	-
Bilingual skills/strategies, immigrant students	1.20	10	0.15	9
Working with mainstreamed students	-	-	0.15	9

* Scale in questionnaire was 0= "very little contribution" to 4= "great contribution"
American N= 89 (out of 158 participating mentors); Israeli N= 9 (out of 21 participating mentors)

American mentors felt strongly about benefits such as, "enthusiasm in teaching," "opportunity to collaborate with a colleague," "knowledge of subject matter," "reflection on practice," "innovative teaching strategies" and "technology use in instruction." Interestingly, the American mentors said that they also gained from student teachers insight into individual students in their own classes. For Israeli mentors, the strongest benefit was the opportunity to collaborate with student teacher, but it was rated relatively low. We wondered what could account for these gaps between the two groups. The reflection sessions and the cross-cultural discourse in 1997 helped us all understand the puzzling finding. Israeli mentors confirmed their low ratings, providing a few explanations:

• The BBC teacher education program does not prepare student teachers for work in innovative schools, so there is little that could be learned from them:

"...from year to year novice teachers are getting worse...they come to me for a job interview and they don't know basic things: classroom management, observations, teachers' planning and record-keeping file....so, many times there is nothing to take from them...once student teachers used to bring innovations to the schools, but today it is the opposite" (school principal).

Since "Afek" Elementary is considered an innovative school, it is possible that the principal feels that student teachers are not innovative enough for her school. Also, the BBC student teachers at "Afek" were all in their first year of study in a four-year program.

• Other explanations given about these data related to logistics. Student teachers familiarity with technology was not utilized by mentors, because "Afek" was not computerized. There were not sufficient planned situations for student teachers to demonstrate what they learn in the College, because their work in the "Afek" classrooms was directed by the mentors to fit the pre-planned curriculum for the class they taught.

•In the face-to-face meeting between Iris, the Israeli mentor, and Judi, Katy L and Kathy Y, the American mentors, another interesting explanation surfaced. Teachers in "Afek" are young (average age is 28) and finished their own studies only a few years earlier. For instance:

"In my case, the student teacher was only three years younger (than me)... I just finished my studies, so there were not many new things that she brought to me" (Iris).

This means that most of the "Afek" teachers are close in age to their mentees (average age is 22), and the mentors were not "hungry" for new instructional ideas and knowledge. This explanation was supported by an earlier statement by one Israeli mentor about an innovation that she learned from her student teacher -- student portfolios, which is a relatively new concept in Israel.

The American mentors supported strongly the perception of student teachers' contribution to them as reflected in the data. The enthusiasm, excitement and zest for learning something new from student teachers might be related to their more mature age and the distance in time from when they were student teachers. Here are two examples of this perception:

" UCI students have contributed greatly to my ways of teaching subjects. That is, UCI's young students bring with them such great, new, exciting and innovative ways of teaching."

"The new generation of teachers is definitely affecting our ways of dealing with technology. They're not afraid . They're enthusiastic. It is a norm to use technology. They are having a wonderful impact on schools. It is much less threatening for a veteran teacher who grew up in a technologically free environment to learn how to use a computer with one person, rather than have to admit in front of a whole group that they don't know. We learn by watching and learning as friends ..."

To sum up, perceptions about what mentors get out of mentoring do not seem to reflect cultural differences as much as they reflect variables such as, age-gap between mentor and student teacher, how much time passed since the mentor graduated from a teacher education program, and organizational factors in the school which facilitate mutual learning between mentor and mentee.

(2) Influence of mentoring experience on the mentors' work in the classroom

If the mentoring experience involves learning new strategies and approaches to coach a student teacher (adult), would some of that new knowledge, skills and understanding "spill over" into teaching children? Do mentors make a connection, say, between the less-judgmental feedback they are expected to give student teachers and the kind of feedback they give to their classroom students? Is there any application and transfer of Cognitive Coaching or what is learned from the student teacher into the mentor's own teaching? Both American and Israeli mentors answered positively and even ranked their answers similarly. Table 2 shows that as a result of the

mentoring experience mentors: (a) engage more in on-going reflective thinking on their own practice; (b) apply with their students Cognitive Coaching skills such as listening, asking inquisitive questions, and providing non-judgmental feedback; (c) reassess their classroom management; (d) use more technology in their instruction; and (e) collaborate more with other teachers in the school.

Table 2*

Impact of Coaching Experience on Mentors' Work in their Own Classrooms

PRACTICE AREAS	UCI MENTORS		BBC MENTORS	
	Average	Rank	Average	Rank
Reflecting more often in planning and and implementation	3.02	1	1.85	1
Using Cognitive Coaching techniques with student in the classroom	2.56	2	1.53	2
Reassessing classroom management and discipline strategies	2.56	2	1.31	3
Using instructional technology more frequently and effectively	2.44	3	0.50	4
Collaborating more with other teachers	2.27	4	0.31	5

*Scale in questionnaire was 0= "very little contribution" to 4= "great contribution"
American N= 89 (out of 158 participating mentors); Israeli N= 9 (out of 21 participating mentors)

The Americans, who feel that they benefit from coaching more than the Israelis, seem to be able to utilize this benefit and channel it into their teaching. Nevertheless, the Israeli mentors were extremely occupied with this issue throughout their reflection sessions. They expressed a much stronger application of Cognitive Coaching in their practice than represented in Table 2 and as seen in the examples below:

"Now, when we use alternative assessment processes ... the data collection piece of the Cognitive Coaching process has prompted me to be more conscientious about collecting concrete evidence during the assessment experience".

"I know that I am very influenced (by the Cognitive Coaching process) and my writing process is influenced, too. Before every assignment I give the children , when I plan it in my head, I ask myself all the time questions in a magnitude much stronger than in the past. In the past, I might not have done it at all. In the classroom, I do a lot of reflection on myself and the kids. In some assignments, I do the reflection with them. It is truly an improvement on both sides (in my own thinking and in working with the children)".

"This year I have teachers coach me when I teach. I show my colleagues what I do n class and we discuss things based on the observations. I know how to interpret the data collected about me, so I can change my behavior".

The contrast between the mild responses in the questionnaire and the strong comments in the reflection sessions was also explored during the cross-cultural meeting. The "impact of time and perspective" was emphasized by the Israeli mentors who claimed that while they were busy mentoring they had little time to think and see how some of what they do with student teachers could be used in their own teaching. This connection was made in one of the reflection sessions half a year after they were released from the role of mentors and could focus again on their work. This shows how consuming the mentoring experience is for mentors. Also, they said that time helps assimilate what they learned and did in 1994-96. Here is further evidence of the effects of time on any change process, and support for the need to allow mentors to think and talk about their experiences.

The American mentors felt strongly about the impact of mentoring on their own teaching. Here is an example of heightened awareness of a mentor when working with her students using Cognitive Coaching:

> *"The use of this kind of thoughtful coaching with students is so powerful, and I don't always do it, but I know that I get better results when I do. I at least have an awareness that makes me feel guilty if I don't ask questions instead of telling. Sometimes I end up telling because the bell is going to ring, but I'm always sad that I didn't lead them to think their way to a point of knowing...".*

The meeting between Iris and her American mentor colleagues did bring out concrete examples of classroom application of Cognitive Coaching . Of particular interest is Iris's story below which shows how students in her 4th grade class applied what they saw her do with her student teacher:

> *"Last week, I asked the children to exchange roles with me. For one day, they became the teacher and I the student. Twelve children experienced being a teacher for one day. I saw that they had really internalized (Cognitive) Coaching in my classroom, because before the lesson they came to me with their written plans. I had not expected them to prepare a written lesson plan. They wanted me to tell them what I thought about the plan before they taught the lesson. During the lesson they wanted me to observe what they were doing. When they saw that I wasn't writing anything down they told me, "Write, write." They wanted me to document what they were doing. At the end, one of the students came and said, "I want to talk with you. I want to see what you wrote down, so I know what I need to do to get better."... They actually did the three stages of Cognitive Coaching (see Appendix A)."*

The mentoring experiences in this study proved to have a significant impact on mentors' own teaching regardless of cultural contexts. In particular, the Cognitive Coaching approach had influenced their thinking about planning, communicating with learners, evaluation and

reflection. This might suggest a productive avenue to tie effectively improved preservice education with reformed practice.

(3) Influence of mentoring experiences on mentors' life beyond the classroom

From a unified and holistic perspective one could expect that the mentoring experience would effect mentors in additional domains of their lives (i.e., not in their own teaching). Through the initial questionnaire we identified two such domains which we labeled "professional life" and "private life". The former emerged as related to the teaching profession in general and commitment to education, and the latter seemed to deal with personal relationships. As we see in Table 3 below, the same pattern identified in the previous questions appears here, too. The impact is perceived higher by the American mentors in both, the professional and private life. In this case there are also differences in the rank order of the items. Also, as we leave the educational domain and move into the personal space the impact weakens.

Table 3*

Averages in Rank Order of

Impact of the Coaching Experience beyond the Classroom

AREAS BEYOND THE CLASSROOM	UCI MENTORS		BBC MENTORS	
	Average	Rank	Average	Rank
A. Professional Life				
More committed to quality teacher education	3.26	1	1.95	1
Validation as a colleague working with uni/college	***3.07***	***2***	***0***	***6***
Renewed enjoyment/enthusiasm about teaching	3.06	2	1.15	3
Increased respect for university/college faculty	***2.89***	***3***	***1.30***	***2***
Considering teacher education as a future career	1.89	5	0.50	4
More motivated to invest in the profession	***2.37***	***4***	***0.31***	***5***
B. Private Life				
Experienced sense of pride as an individual	2.90	1	0.81	1
More effectively helping people to do their own thinking/problem solving	***2.80***	***2***	***0.46***	***3***
Demonstrating more respect in relationships	2.52	3	0.38	4
Communicating/interacting with others more confidently	***2.50***	***4***	***0.54***	***2***
Change attitudes in dealing with family members	1.22	5	0.38	4

*Scale in questionnaire was 0= "very little contribution" to 4= "great contribution" American N= 89 (out of 158 participating mentors); Israeli N= 9 (out of 21 participating mentors)

Of special interest are the two "winners" which all mentors chose as most powerful: "more committed to quality teacher education" (professional life) and "experienced sense of pride as an individual" (private life). Commitment to teacher education together with "increased respect for university/college faculty" hint that the mentoring approach and our collaborative action research contributed to mentors' professional image, self-confidence and positive attitude toward the partnership. This commitment served as an encouraging feedback to us to continue along the same principles and methods.

Another important finding, which came up in the reflection sessions, is that which deals with improved human relations inside and outside the profession. For instance, a reading specialist in "Afek" Elementary said that Cognitive Coaching helped her a lot in working with the principal. Another mentor said:

> *"Being able to listen and reflect has nothing to do with schooling and the work you take home. I do think that you take with you these things home. Reflection is a wonderful tool to use as human beings".*

During the cross-cultural "foursome" meeting in Spring 1997, the American mentors cited concrete relations with own children, husband and friends which improved as they deliberately used Cognitive Coaching skills. Two examples are:

> *"I use what I've learned when talking with my husband. We talk and listen more to one another."*

> *"My children say that I am now listening more to them in order to understand them. Rather than just listening on the surface and nodding my approval or disapproval."*

In the reflection sessions in Israel, some mentors explained the low quantitative impact of mentoring on their lives beyond the classroom by saying that they misinterpreted this question

on the questionnaire. This might imply that there was a problem with this question and the data in Table 3 are therefore, not accurate. Others claimed that they intentionally distinguish work from private life and do not want to carry home things related to school and work. The face-to-face discussions have not shed a new light on the findings.

Mentoring seems to influence mentors' professional lives and to a lesser degree their private lives in both countries. It clearly increases commitment to teacher education and enhances human relations and interaction for all mentors, although for Americans more than for Israelis.

Summary

This study supports the commonsense beliefs and empirical findings that mentors benefit from their mentoring activity (e.g., Clements, 1996; Shaw, 1995; Reich, 1995; Turner, 1995; Andrews, 1987) when they have access to serious training and opportunities for ongoing support. It goes one step further by mapping these benefits in more detail, and by shedding light on mentors' preferences of these benefits, which are presented in the rankings in Tables 1-3.

A number of themes grew out of the various data which do not relate directly to the three research questions. These themes emerged from the dialogue meetings, informal communications, comments on the questionnaire, reflection sessions and finally the Israeli-American mentors' meeting. We summarize them briefly as they might help better understand the mentoring process.

First, "Talking" does seem to be a most important component in developing awareness and understanding of the mentor's role in a college or university PDS collaboration (Johnston, 1996). It is simply not enough to "do" mentoring in order to internalize it and be aware of its potential and impact. One needs to talk about it with others in different situations. The dialogue meetings and reflection sessions are, therefore, important components in sustaining mentoring.

Second, mentoring needs a long time to develop. We found that Israeli mentors began to come to grips with their new role only in the third year, and that in the US, too, some teachers developed their "mentor identity" after spending more time in the process. Third, preparation for mentoring seems indeed important. All mentors repeatedly acknowledged the crucial role of training in Cognitive Coaching for their mentor activity.

Finally, we learned that successful mentoring processes seem dependent upon many factors. A few were identified during this study, but were not highlighted earlier in this paper: (1) a well-planned annual schedule for mentoring is required; (2) the allocation of time blocks for coaching is a necessary condition for meaningful mentoring; (3) the mutual development (mentors and university/college faculty) of the student teaching component is important ; (4) the need to bring university/college faculty to share their expertise with the school is recommended; (5) some guidelines for selection of mentors need to be developed with clear criteria for participation; and (6) an on-going clarification of the mentor's role and the university or college advisor's role is helpful.

Recently, we learned that the staff at "Afek" Elementary developed a peer-coaching system for teachers following the concepts and methods they used with student teachers. They also wrote a document describing the school's mission and included their collaboration with teacher education as a main component. In the UCI/PDS program, 39 mentors who participated in the 1993 training , continue to coach UCI student teachers. New teachers are trained annually with over 200 currently trained in Cognitive Coaching. Such developments attest to the lasting effects of the mentoring approach used in each BBC and UCI program.

Appendix A

COGNITIVE COACHING CYCLE

(Based on the Cognitive Coaching Model developed by Arthur Costa and Robert Garmston. Adapted by Marilyn Tabor, 11/93.)

THE PLANNING CONFERENCE

The coach mediates by having the teacher:

- **Clarify student outcome(s) for the lesson.**
- **Clarify the lesson plan and teaching strategies.**
- **Clarify methods for gathering evidence of student learning.**
- **Identify the coach's data-gathering focus and procedures.**

TEACHING AND OBSERVATION

The coach gathers data by observing:

- **Teaching strategies, decisions, and behaviors.**
- **Evidence of student learning.**

THE REFLECTING CONFERENCE

The coach mediates by having the teacher:

- **Summarize personal impressions and assessment of the lesson.**
- **Recall data supporting impressions and assessment.**
- **Compare planned lesson and teaching decisions to actual lesson and teaching decisions.**
- **Analyze the data gathered by the coach.**
- **Determine relationships between student learning and teacher decisions/behaviors.**
- **Generalize personal learning and construct future applications.**

REFERENCES

Anderson, R.C. (1993) *Voices of Change: a Report of the Clinical Schools Project* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education).

Andrews, I. H. (1987) Induction programs - staff development opportunities for beginning and experienced teachers, in: Wideen, M. and Andrews, I. H. *Staff development for staff improvement* (Lewes: Falmer Press).

Ariav, T. & Clinard, L.M. (1996) Does coaching student teachers affect the professional development and teaching of mentor teachers? A cross-cultural perspective. Paper presented at The Second International Conference Teacher Education: Stability, Evolution and Revolution, MOFET Institute, Israel, June 30-July 4.

Borko, H. & Mayfield, V. (1995). The roles of mentor teachers and university supervisors in learning to teach. *Teaching and Teaching Education,* 11, 5, pp. 501-518.

Clinard, L.M., Miron, L., Ariav, T., Botzer, I., Conroy J., Laycock, K., & Yule, K. (1997). A cross-cultural perspective of teachers' perceptions: What contributions are exchanged between cooperating teachers and student teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago,

Clinard, L.M., Ariav, T., Beeson, R., Dwyer, M. & Minor, L. (1995) Mentor teachers reflect upon the impact of coaching on their own teaching and professional life. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Clinard, L.M. & Roosevelt, M. (1993) New directions in K-12/university partnerships. *Didactics.* Irvine: University of California, Irvine, Department of Education, December.

Clement, M. C. (1996) How to establish a mentor program. *Tips for Principals.*(Reston, VA: Association of Secondary School Principals) (April).

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991) Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61, 3, pp. 279-310.

Costa, A. L. & Garmston, R.J. (1994) *Cognitive Coaching: A Foundation for Renaissance Schools* (Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.).

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994) (Ed.) *Professional development schools* (New York: Teachers College Press).

Feiman-Nemser, S., Parker, M. B., & Zeichner, K. (1993) Are mentor teachers teacher educators? in: McIntyre, D., Hagger, H. & Wilkin, M. (Eds.) *Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education*, pp. 147-165 (London: Kogan Page).

Franke, A. & Dahlgrew, L. O. (1996) Conceptions of mentoring: An empirical study of conceptions of mentoring during the school-based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12, 6 , pp. 627-641.

Furlong, J. & Maynard, T. (1995) *Mentoring student teachers: The growth of professional knowledge* (London and New York: Routledge).

Goodlad, J. I. (1991) A study of the education of educators: One year later. *Phi Delta Kappan*, December issue, pp. 311-316.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass).

Goswami, D. & Stillman, P. R. (1987) (Eds.) *Reclaiming the Classroom: Teacher Research as an Agency for Change* (Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton-Cook).

Grimmett, P.P. (1996) Restructuring and the struggle for energy and hope in teacher education: A call for reconceptualization of practice. Keynote Address presented at The Second International Conference Teacher Education: Stability, Evolution and Revolution, MOFET Institute, Israel. June 30-July 4.

Holmes Group (1995) *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (East Lansing, Michigan: Autor).

Holmes Group (1990) *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools (*East Lansing, Michigan: Author).

Holmes Group (1986) *Tomorrow's Teachers* (East Lansing, Michigan: Author).

Jacque, K. (1995) Mentoring in initial teacher education, in: Kerry, T & Shelton, M. (Eds.) *Issues in mentoring*, pp.111-119 (London and New York in association with The Open University: Routledge).

Johnston, M. (1996) Collaboration in teacher education: Unexpected outcomes. Keynote address presented at The Second International Conference Teacher Education: Stability, Evolution and Revolution, MOFET Institute, Israel. June 30-July 4.

Kelly, M., Beck, T. & apThomas, J. (1995) Mentoring as a staff development activity, in: Kerry, T. & Shelton, M. (Eds.) *Issues in mentoring*, pp. 253-259 (London and new York in association with The Open University: Routledge).

Lee, S. & Wilkes, J. (1996) Mentoring models and the role of mentor teachers: New roles and responsibilities: Implications for continuing professional development. Paper presented at The Second International Conference Teacher Education: Stability, Evolution and Revolution. MOFET Institute, Israel. June 30-July 4.

Levine, M. (1992) (Ed.) Professional practice schools-- linking teacher education and school reform (New York: Teachers College Press).

Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (1990) Teacher development in professional practice schools. *Teachers College Record*, 92, 1, pp. 105-122.

Oja, S.N. & Smulyan, L. (1989) *Collaborative Action Research: A Developmental Approach* (New York: The Falmer Press).

Pine, G. J. (1997) Professional Development Schools: Quo Vadis? Issues and questions. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Conference, Phoenix.

Powel, H. J. et al. (1995) Adjusting the focus: Teachers' roles and responsibilities in school/university collaboration. *The Teacher Educator*, 31, 1 , pp. 1-33.

Reich, M. (1995) The mentor connection, in: Kerry, T. & Shelton, M. (Eds.) *Issues in mentoring*, pp. 136-143 (London and new York in association with The Open University: Routledge).

Shaw, R. (1995) Mentoring, in: Kerry, T. & Shelton, M. (Eds.) *Issues in mentoring*, pp. 259-267 (London and new York in association with The Open University: Routledge).

Tsui, A. B .M. (1995) . Exploring collaborative supervision in in-service teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 10, 4, pp. 346-371.

Turner, M. (1995) The role of mentors and teacher tutors in school-based teacher education and induction, in: Kerry, T. & Shelton, M. (Eds.) *Issues in mentoring (London and new York in association with The Open University: Routledge).*

Ungaretti, T., Cohen, L., Fessler, R., Johnstone, J. & Clemson R. (1996) Collaborative Professional Development School partnerships: Revolution in the evolution of teacher education. Symposium presented at The Second International Conference Teacher Education: Stability, Evolution and Revolution MOFET Institute, Israel. June 30-July 4.

Wileen, M. F. & Grimmett, P. P. (1995) (Eds.) *Changing times in teacher education: restructuring or reconceptualization* (Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press).

Winograd, K., Higgins, K., McEwan, B. & Haddon, L. (1995) Relinquishing field supervision to the mentors: University teacher educators rethink their practice. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Zeichner, K. (1997) Action research as professional development in one urban school district. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.